

Please keep the air clean and do NOT build a Biomass Plant in Springfield MA.
To DOER:

I attended DOER's Public Meeting on Biomass Policy last week.
First up were the Manomet Biomass Study Team. The purpose of the study was to:

1. Determine how much wood was available from biomass forest harvesting.
2. Determine the greenhouse gas implications.
3. Determine the ecological implications of increasing forest biomass harvesting.

The Agenda for the first hour of this meeting meeting was to summarize the findings of the Manomet Biomass Study. The public questions for the first hour were supposed to focus on the study, methodology, and findings. However, the anti-biomass extremists didn't pay attention to the ground rules and began to cry about fictitious health risks and imaginary forest depletion. But there were many pro-biomass rational people there as well. A Tree Farmer from the town of Russell said that the Manomet Study was flawed because it didn't account for all the clean waste wood that would be used at Russell Biomass such as roadside tree removals and other suburban tree removals, power line maintenance, and waste wood from other sources which has a much higher carbon dividend. And he was exactly right.

A member of the Russell Conservation Commission spoke in favor of Russell Biomass. Others spoke out in favor of it too.

I listened to the directions and followed the ground rules by asking the Manomet Study Team how well they analyzed the Forest Cutting Plan data because looking at their own report and figuring what the average Forest Cutting Plan is, it looks like biomass is 11% better than coal rather than 3% worse. I was assured that they looked at the Forest Cutting Plan data intensely but where is the breakdown of this data into the various "Harvest Scenarios"?

The Agenda for the second hour was supposed to be about Biomass Policy and the key issues that DOER would like to receive input. A second round of public questions was allowed. However, when I got up again to give a quick overview of the benefits of forest biomass harvesting, the anti-biomass extremists started whining real loudly that I had already spoken and I was shouted down while the DOER bureaucrats acquiesced to the radicals. Well I went to the back of the line and when I got to the front I told the DOER bureaucrat I would be brief and he thought he was giving me a break but he didn't even remember the ground rules! Some of the radical extremists started to whine again but I grabbed the microphone and said:

The big failure of the Manomet Study was that it did not look at the huge silvicultural dividends of forest biomass.

The best thing about biomass is that we can:

- 1. Restore degraded woodlots due to past highgrading.**
- 2. Provide for much needed oak regeneration.**
- 3. Promote forests that are more resilient and resistant to climate change.**
- 4. Encourage more landowners to keep their land in forest because landowners love the way their woodlots look after a biomass improvement cutting.**

I also wanted to say that we can provide as many as 2,000 new jobs.

Note to Ian Bowles: Next time you have a public meeting, tell your employees to remember and enforce the ground rules! It was a disgrace that they allowed a group of disrespectful extremists to continuously disrupt the meeting and not follow the rules.

Mike Leonard, Consulting Forester
North Quabbin Forestry - www.northquabbinforestry.com
35 Leighton Road
Petersham, MA 01366